



**THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: G. Zhang et al

Attorney Docket: 970663.CON

Serial No.: 09/206,329

Group Art Unit: 3762

Filed: December 8, 1998

Examiner: Evanisko, G.

For: AUTOCAPTURE PACING/SENSING CONFIGURATION

3762  
#12  
CD  
2/1/01

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
JAN 25 2001  
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 27, 2000, please enter the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

This Amendment and Response is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed October 27, 2000. Claims 1 through 36 are pending. Claims 19, 23 and 30 have been amended above. Support for the amendments can be found generally throughout the specification and figures.

Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

Regarding Claim 1 and 19, Examiner contends that "reduced capacitance" is a relative term and is therefore vague. Examiner states that there is no reference to compare the coupling capacitance with so that it can be "reduced." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of Claims 1 and 19. As Examiner knows, the use of terms of degree claim language does not automatically render a claim indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The acceptability of the claim language depends on whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed in light of the specification. (See M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(b)). In view of